REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 21, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-30 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 1-6, 8-11, 15-20, and 23-30.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kanesaka et al. (JP Pat. Pub. No. 06-265919) in view of Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,867) and Honda (U.S. Patent No. 4,950,072). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Rejecting claim 7, the Examiner acknowledges cites Kanesaka et al. as allegedly teaching "a liquid crystal display device including ... [a] printed circuit board ... and a shielding case for housing the ... printed circuit board.... [wherein the] shielding case ... is provided with an opening ... [that is] coated with [a] sealing cover." The Examiner acknowledges that Kanesaka et al. and Shimada et al. fails to either disclose "the required elastically deformable cover portion" or the "elastic portion to be deformable." Attempting to cure these deficiencies, the Examiner relies upon Honda as allegedly disclosing "a presentation device for overhead projector where... the required elastic portion is specified as deformable" and asserts it would have been obvious to "include the required elastic cover portion in Kanesaka et al. as taught by Shimada et al. and Honda respectively ... to have a liquid crystal display apparatus with higher reliability." Applicant, however, respectfully disagrees.

Assuming *arguendo* that Shimada et al. and Honda disclose what they are alleged to disclose, Applicant respectfully submits there is no permissible motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of any of the secondary references with Kanesaka et al. to arrive at the claimed invention. According to M.P.E.P. § 2144, sources of rationale for combining references may be derived from: (1) a recognition, expressly or impliedly in applied references; (2) drawn from a convincing line of reasoning based on established scientific principles; or (3) legal

precedent, wherein such sources indicate that some advantage or expected beneficial result would have been produced by their combination. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the apparently boilerplate statement used by the Examiner, suggesting the combination of Kanesaka et al. and the alleged teachings of the aforementioned secondary references with Kanesaka et al. would have been obvious "in order to have a liquid crystal display apparatus with higher reliability," is merely a conclusion and is unsupported by any of the aforementioned sources of rationale. In the absence of any requisite rationale supporting the combination of Kanesaka et al. with Shimada et al. and Honda, Applicant respectfully submits the aforementioned references have merely been combined together using the presently claimed invention as a template via improper hindsight reasoning. For at least this reason, Applicant requests withdrawal of the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Iizumi (U.S. Patent No. 4,850,228) in view of Shimada et al. and Honda. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The basis for the rejection of claims 12-14 is similar to the basis of the rejection of claim 7. Therefore, remarks provided above with respect to the rejection of claim 7 are equally applicable with respect to the present rejection of claims 12-14.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takeishi (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0005240) in view of Shimada et al. and Honda. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The basis for the rejection of claims 21 and 22 is similar to the basis of the rejection of claims 7 and 12-14. Therefore, remarks provided above with respect to the rejection of claim 7 are equally applicable with respect to the present rejection of claims 7 and 12-14.

Applicant believes the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 21, 2005 By _____
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No. 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant